

Applicant: Frank John Marszalkowski, Jr.  
U.S.S.N.: 10/783,123

### REMARKS

In response to the Office action mailed December 29, 2004, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration. To further the prosecution of the application, claims 1, 4, 7, 8 and 10 are amended, and claims 2 and 3 are canceled. Claim 15 was previously amended by way of a Preliminary Amendment mailed on June 18, 2004. Accordingly, claims 1 and 4-15 remain pending, of which claims 1, 11 and 15 are in independent form. The application as presented is believed to be in allowable condition.

Applicant acknowledges and appreciates allowance of claim 15 and the willingness to allow claims 6 and 13 (provided they are written in independent form) by the Examiner in the Office action.

Claims 1, 7-11 and 14 are rejected in the Office action as being obvious and unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Rossmeisl et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,324,973) in view of Reber et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,491,871). Claims 4, 5 and 12 are rejected as being obvious and unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Rossmeisl et al. in view of Reber et al., and further in view of Takahashi et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2001/0017086).

As amended, claim 1 is directed to an apparatus for performing operations on a surface of an electronic substrate. The apparatus comprises:

- a frame;
- a dispenser, coupled to the frame, to dispense a material onto the electronic substrate;
- a stencil translatable on a gantry system, the stencil having at least one aperture to receive the material as the material is dispensed on the substrate by the dispenser;
- a controller that controls dispensing of the material on the substrate; and
- a *fixed* wiper to remove material from the stencil as the stencil is translated away from the electronic substrate by the gantry system *and over the fixed wiper*.

As asserted by the Examiner, Rossmeisl et al. teach an apparatus for forming a pattern on the substrate having a frame, a dispenser which dispenses a material onto the substrate through a stencil, and a controller to control dispensing of the material on the substrate. However, Rossmeisl et al. fail to teach the wiper which removes material from the stencil as the stencil is moved away from the substrate. The Examiner further asserts that Reber et al. teach the wiper (26) which removes material under the stencil (20) as the stencil is moved away from the

Applicant: Frank John Marszalkowski, Jr.  
U.S.S.N.: 10/783,123

substrate (18). It is the Examiner's view that it would have been obvious to modify the apparatus of Rossmeisl et al. by providing the wiper as taught by Reber et al.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. There is no teaching in the references of record, especially Reber et al., of an apparatus having a fixed wiper to remove material from the stencil as the stencil is translated away from the electronic substrate by the gantry system and over the fixed wiper. Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Reber et al. disclose a *movable* wiper. The Examiner's attention is directed to col. 3, lines 1-42 of Reber et al. Specifically, the stencil cleaning assembly (24) disclosed in Reber et al. is carried by the slide (10). A wiper/vacuum subassembly of the stencil cleaning assembly is moved from one end of the stencil (shown in FIG. 2 of Reber et al.) to the other end of the stencil (shown in FIG. 3 of Reber et al.). Thus, Reber et al. fail to disclose the fixed wiper as specified in amended claim 1.

Accordingly, claim 1 is submitted as non-obvious and patentable over the references relied on by the Examiner.

Claims 4, 5 and 7-10, which depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 11 is directed to a method for performing a printing operation on a surface of a substrate. The method comprises:

- transporting the substrate into a position for printing a material onto the substrate;
- aligning the substrate and a stencil, the stencil having at least one aperture to receive the material as the material is deposited onto the substrate;
- depositing the material through the stencil and onto the substrate; and
- translating the stencil from a position over the surface of the substrate, *over a fixed wiper* positioned to remove a residual material from the surface of the stencil as the stencil is translated.

For the same reasons given for claim 1, amended claim 11 is patentable over the references of record, including Reber et al., since none of the references disclose the method step of translating the stencil over the fixed wiper to remove residual material from the stencil. Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 11 is respectfully requested.

Claims 12 and 14, which depend from claim 11, are submitted as being patentable for the same reasons given for claim 11.

Applicant: Frank John Marszalkowski, Jr.  
U.S.S.N.: 10/783,123

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the foregoing, the application is believed to be in allowable condition and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions regarding the application, he is invited to contact the Applicants' Attorney at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Keith F. Noe, Esq. (Reg. No. 34,686)  
LOWRIE, LANDO & ANASTASI, LLP  
Riverfront Office Park  
One Main Street  
Cambridge, MA 02142  
Tel.: (617) 395-7039  
Fax: (617) 395-7070  
Attorney for Applicant

Dated: February 4, 2005  
Attorney Docket No.: M2010-7129

757480.1